

N DAYS GONE BY.

Political Reminiscences of Some of New York's Well-Known Men.

Jimmie Hayes Tells How John Morrissey Came to Be a Congressman.

Bud and Blossom of the Champion Fugitive's Political Life.

Who does not know "Jimmie" Hayes, the cheery, smiling doorkeeper of the Excise Department?

James Hayes is nearly sixty-three years old, though he doesn't appear to be more than forty-five. He was a Fourteenth Ward boy, and has been honored by that ward as member of the ancient Board of Supervisors and by the Board of Councilmen, an institution of a quarter century back, with the Presidency of the Board.

Assemblyman Hayes sat in the Legislature at one time, too, and with an inimitable quirk of his mouth doorkeeper Hayes will tell you that once he owned houses in Bleecker street, houses in First street and his check was good for \$50,000.

"Now I ain't got a cent," he will add, with the same cheerfulness that characterizes all his utterances. "Not a cent, and my wife and I are just as happy. I can't get about very fast, for I'm partially paralyzed in my legs, but I'm spry yet for a man of my years."

The youngest part of Mr. Hayes is his heart. That bounds as buoyantly as it did when he was the gallant forerunner of "No. 9 Engine" in the old Volunteer Fire Department.

Hayes was a power in politics once. It was he who created John Morrissey, politically, and it was the story of Morrissey in bud and blossom that an Evening World man sought of the light-hearted doorkeeper.

"Of course I can remember all about John Morrissey," retorted Mr. Hayes with a peculiar contemptuous wagging of his iron-gray head and a reproachful twinkle of the eye.

"In 1866 John had '818,' and he had a place at 5 West Twenty-fourth street. Ed Haggerty, John Brice and I went to see him there one night. We wanted a favor of him; '818' held the same position among gamblers that Stewart's or Claffin's did in the dry-goods trade."

"What was the favor, Mr. Hayes?" the reporter queried, gently leading the doorkeeper back to the subject.

"Brice wanted to be elected President of the Board of Aldermen. The President was elected by the Board in those days. Jimmie O'Brien was Alderman from the Twenty-first Ward and we wanted John Morrissey to get O'Brien to vote for Brice."

"John shook his head."

"Look here," says I. "Do that and I'll get you anything you want."

"John didn't reply, and I says: 'Get O'Brien to vote for Brice and I'll get you the delegation for Congress.'"

"'Hold on!' says John. 'I don't know as I want to go to Congress.'"

"I say to you, says I. 'Didn't a man who was champion of England become a member of Parliament?'"

"That was John Guiley, you know. I lie fought and won the championship in 1805 to 1808. Then he kept the 'Plough' public house in Lincoln's Inn Fields, London, and a gambling house. Then he made a fortune in the coal business and sat in Parliament for Pontefract for years."

"Well, John says, 'all right, I'll do it.' When I told Tweed, he kicked, but I coaxed, and finally he said he'd stand anywhere that the Fourteenth Ward presented as candidate for the Fifth Congressional District."

"That was the first John Morrissey ever thought of being a Congressman. I managed his canvass for him. Nelson Taylor, a Brigadier-General just returned from the war, ran against Morrissey as a stump Democratic candidate, and Ennes Elliott was the Republican candidate."

"Beat? Why, beat 'em hands down! Beat Gen. Taylor by 3,700 and Elliott by 6,900."

"John couldn't make a speech. He was a big, broad, handsome, stalwart fellow, with a full brown beard, but his voice was cracked and squeaky. It cracked whenever he tried to speak otherwise than very low."

"John and I used to go about the District. We'd meet a man, and I'd half whisper, 'See that man, John.'"

"Then John would step up to the man and say: 'Say, do you know who I am? I'm John Morrissey.'"

"No!" the man would return, stepping back and looking at him.

"I say I am. I'm running for Congress and I want your support. Do I get it?"

"The voter always promised, of course. We went the rounds of the public houses. Some places the proprietor would be out and the wife would be behind the bar."

"John was a handsome, manly-looking fellow, and he'd walk right up, stick out his hand and say: 'Do you know me? I'm John Morrissey, and I want you to help me. I'm running for Congress and I want you to get your husband to support me. Will you do it?'"

"John always caught the women! Horace Greeley's paper was hot against Morrissey. It said, and placards distributed all over the district said, that Morrissey was a convict and had been to the penitentiary for burglary."

"The District Attorney of Rensselaer County telegraphed down here that Morrissey had never been indicted for burglary."

"Doorkeeper Hayes chuckled quietly to himself, and then, in a burst of confidence, said: "John had been in Albany Penitentiary for street fighting when he was a Troy lad of sixteen or seventeen years."

"The canvass was a hot one. One night a speaker against John was addressing a

crowd of longshoremen down on the East River front.

"Who's John Morrissey? What has he ever done for the workingman?" he shouted. "Be jabbers, he kicked John C. Heenan and Yankee Sullivan," said a voice in the audience. This raised a great laugh and broke up the meeting.

"You know Morrissey did kick George Thompson on Mare Island, near San Francisco, in 1852. Then he fought Yankee Sullivan in 1853 at Boston Corner, and Heenan at Long Point, Canada, in 1857."

"Along in '59 Morrissey went down to fight Bill Poole. Bill selected the dock at the foot of Amos street. John objected and said: 'I'll bet you \$50 you won't name another place!'"

"Bill Poole took the bet, and then named the next pier and won the bet. So they fought on the Christopher street pier. John put up his hands to Bill and John Poole struck him on the side of the face."

"Hello!" says John, without turning his eyes off Bill. "Is that the way you fight here?"

"Bill pounded and pounded. He broke John's nose and bruised him all up, but John never flinched, nor seemed to mind it. The Poole gang saw that Bill couldn't lick Morrissey, but they wouldn't let him whip Bill Poole."

"But that ain't politics, John had his headquarters at the Anson House, Spring and Crosby streets. At public meetings women would hold their children up in their arms to see John Morrissey, the 'workingman's candidate.' Instead of a speech John would stand up and say, 'This is your fight—not mine, I win my fights.'"

"The district was made up of the Seventh, Tenth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth wards, and John Morrissey was the lion of the day. He was the most generous, and most charitable man I ever knew, but in that canvass, when money was mentioned, he'd always say, 'you'll have to see Hayes.'"

"The canvass cost him \$10,000."

"In 1868 we ran him against James M. McCarth and George Francis Train. He beat McCarth 11,000 and Train 13,500. John never spoke in Congress, but he was a quietly effective member."

"In 1873 John beat John Fox for the State Senate in the Fourth Senatorial district and in 1877 we ran him against Augustus Schell in the Seventh, the most high toned aristocratic, 'kid-glove' district in the city and he beat Schell too easy."

"Morrissey was not much of a hand at writing, and he had a man who wrote and signed his name to letters addressed to all kinds of people."

"There was no better member of the Senate than he. When the repeal of the 'Gray Nurse' bill' was up and the Times was clamoring for the repeal on the ground that it was a sectarian law, Morrissey made a short speech on it."

"The bill was a sort of legislative license to certain French-Canadian Sisters to teach the children of the timber cutters that came over from Canada and camped in the Adirondacks. Morrissey said the bill took no money from the treasury and only privileged the nuns to give the children of the woodchoppers the education that he had never had himself."

"There were tears in his eyes and on his face. 'I represent a New York district with 85 per cent. of its people Roman Catholic,' said Morrissey, 'and the Church does not want the law.'"

"Then he voted for the Repeal bill. It was passed, and the wind was taken out of the Republican sails."

"When the workingmen held a meeting to protest against the reduction of laborers' pay in the Department of Public Works in 1875 from \$2 to \$1.00 a day, Morrissey gave \$50 towards the expense."

"Senator Morrissey died May 1, 1878, in Saratoga. Both Houses of the Legislature were in mourning and half the Senators delivered eulogies. Senator Tom Ecclesine made the grandest effort of his life in his eulogy of John Morrissey. He talked of charity and wept like a child."

"Morrissey was buried in Troy. The grave of Gen. Worth is there, too. If you ask a Troy boy where Worth's grave is, ten to one he can't tell. But ask him where John Morrissey lies and he'll take you to the spot every time."

"How did Senator Morrissey stand on the Public Burials bill, Mr. Hayes?" the reporter asked.

"How? Right, of course. John Morrissey was the friend of the working people. He was right every time."

"He was immensely wealthy at one time, but he died poor. His wife was Susan Smith, the daughter of Levi Smith, the captain of a Hudson River steamboat. He married her in 1854. She was and is a splendid woman, and as my house we call her 'Sue.'"

"John Morrissey was born in Ireland Feb. 8, 1831, and he was just past forty-seven years old when he died."

"There, you have all that I know about the political life of John Morrissey, and no man knows more."

HITCH IN SIMMONS'S TRIAL.

Judge Benedict Suddenly Adjourns Court Until Monday.

The trial of James A. Simmons, charged with wrecking the Sixth National Bank, was to have been resumed at 11 o'clock this morning. Judge Benedict, of the United States Circuit Court, adjourned the trial till 11:40.

He then surprised the lawyers and bank officials present in court by saying from the bench: "Certain matters have come to my knowledge which render it proper and necessary for me to adjourn the case until Monday at 11 o'clock."

Judge Benedict was afterwards closed for more than an hour by the late King Kalakaua's state has come to the throne: "Her acquisition of the throne will make no difference so far as the Government's relations to other powers is concerned."

"It is announced, this talk about British acquisition of our island, and the story could only have emanated from the fertile minds of San Francisco reporters. It is best for us to remain as we are, perfectly independent and neutral, and there is every reason to believe this will be our destiny."

MR. WILSON'S SQUINTING SYNDROM for children getting green spots, hepatic fever. See a bottle.

FASSETT INQUIRY RENEWED.

Ex-Corporation Counsel Beekman Testifies in Place of Mayor Hewitt.

Another session of the perennial Fassett Committee was held to-day in Part III. of the Superior Court. Senators Fassett and Stewart were the only members of the Committee present.

It was expected that ex-Mayor Abram S. Hewitt would testify before the Committee to-day.

In response to the request of the Committee, however, Mr. Hewitt sent a letter to Senator Fassett, in which he stated that he was now out of public life and that he had nothing to add in regard to the affairs of the city and its government to what he had already made public in his official communications while Mayor of the city.

He therefore, deputized ex-Corporation Counsel Henry W. Beekman to appear for him, and present his communications to the Committee as they appeared.

Mr. Beekman was sworn and proceeded to make a long statement in regard to the affairs of the city and its government in the Department and the ownership of land along the water front.

Senator Stewart inquired of the Committee would like to get at what Mr. Beekman said to advise as to the management of the water front, and the question was referred to the Committee to frame a proper law upon the subject.

Mr. Beekman said that while he was Corporation Counsel he had prepared a bill for the condemnation of the rights of private owners along the water front. The outcroppings of land would be the same as those of the Aqueduct and it was the only way in which the controversy could be definitely settled.

There was opposition to the bill at Albany, and it was never passed. The question has never yet been determined by the courts.

Mr. Beekman said that he had recommended more drastic measures for the condemnation of private property by the city.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

FASSETT INQUIRY RENEWED.

Ex-Corporation Counsel Beekman Testifies in Place of Mayor Hewitt.

Another session of the perennial Fassett Committee was held to-day in Part III. of the Superior Court. Senators Fassett and Stewart were the only members of the Committee present.

It was expected that ex-Mayor Abram S. Hewitt would testify before the Committee to-day.

In response to the request of the Committee, however, Mr. Hewitt sent a letter to Senator Fassett, in which he stated that he was now out of public life and that he had nothing to add in regard to the affairs of the city and its government to what he had already made public in his official communications while Mayor of the city.

He therefore, deputized ex-Corporation Counsel Henry W. Beekman to appear for him, and present his communications to the Committee as they appeared.

Mr. Beekman was sworn and proceeded to make a long statement in regard to the affairs of the city and its government in the Department and the ownership of land along the water front.

Senator Stewart inquired of the Committee would like to get at what Mr. Beekman said to advise as to the management of the water front, and the question was referred to the Committee to frame a proper law upon the subject.

Mr. Beekman said that while he was Corporation Counsel he had prepared a bill for the condemnation of the rights of private owners along the water front. The outcroppings of land would be the same as those of the Aqueduct and it was the only way in which the controversy could be definitely settled.

There was opposition to the bill at Albany, and it was never passed. The question has never yet been determined by the courts.

Mr. Beekman said that he had recommended more drastic measures for the condemnation of private property by the city.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

FASSETT INQUIRY RENEWED.

Ex-Corporation Counsel Beekman Testifies in Place of Mayor Hewitt.

Another session of the perennial Fassett Committee was held to-day in Part III. of the Superior Court. Senators Fassett and Stewart were the only members of the Committee present.

It was expected that ex-Mayor Abram S. Hewitt would testify before the Committee to-day.

In response to the request of the Committee, however, Mr. Hewitt sent a letter to Senator Fassett, in which he stated that he was now out of public life and that he had nothing to add in regard to the affairs of the city and its government to what he had already made public in his official communications while Mayor of the city.

He therefore, deputized ex-Corporation Counsel Henry W. Beekman to appear for him, and present his communications to the Committee as they appeared.

Mr. Beekman was sworn and proceeded to make a long statement in regard to the affairs of the city and its government in the Department and the ownership of land along the water front.

Senator Stewart inquired of the Committee would like to get at what Mr. Beekman said to advise as to the management of the water front, and the question was referred to the Committee to frame a proper law upon the subject.

Mr. Beekman said that while he was Corporation Counsel he had prepared a bill for the condemnation of the rights of private owners along the water front. The outcroppings of land would be the same as those of the Aqueduct and it was the only way in which the controversy could be definitely settled.

There was opposition to the bill at Albany, and it was never passed. The question has never yet been determined by the courts.

Mr. Beekman said that he had recommended more drastic measures for the condemnation of private property by the city.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.

Mr. Beekman thought that if the city was the landlord and sole owner of the docks it could not be a matter of private ownership. The city was torn to underlie the duties of a landlord, without any of the emoluments of the position.